

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 4 and 9 are amended. The Examiner has indicated that Claims 15-20 are allowable. The Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of Claims 15-20.

### Specification

The specification and the abstract are objected to for reasons cited in the instant Office Action. The specification and the abstract are amended to address those objections.

### Claim Objections

Claim 4 is objected to for reasons cited in the instant Office Action. Claim 4 is amended to address the objection.

### Double Patenting

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1-14 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/791,459. A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.321 is being submitted concurrent with the instant response, thereby obviating the double patenting rejection.

### 102 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by De et al. ("De;" U.S. Patent Application No. 6,100,751). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference

and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-14 is not shown or suggested by De.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that De does not show or suggest "a plurality of devices under test, each device under test subject to a body bias voltage; ... wherein said body bias voltage is selected from information comprising leakage current values indexed by body bias voltage values and wherein said body bias voltage is selected to substantially minimize leakage current associated with said devices under test" as recited in independent Claim 1. Claims 2-8 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations.

Also, Applicants respectfully submit that De does not show or suggest "applying a body bias voltage to said devices under test, wherein said body bias voltage is selected from information comprising leakage current values indexed by body bias voltage values and wherein application of said body bias voltage substantially minimizes leakage current associated with said devices under test" as recited in independent Claim 9. Claims 10-14 are dependent on Claim 9 and recite additional limitations.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-14 traverse the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and are in condition for allowance.

### Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-14 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Applicants have reviewed the references cited but not relied upon. Applicants did not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. Patent Nos. 5,119,337; 5,406,212; 5,844,429; 6,037,792; 6,104,061; 6,114,866; 6,157,201; 6,137,301; 6,218,892; 6,262,588 and 6,310,485.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 12/11/04

William A. Zarbis

William A. Zarbis  
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060